REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. Claims 5 and 17 were previously canceled. Hence, Claims 1-4, 6-16 and 18-30 are pending in this application. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed February 5, 2010 are addressed hereinafter.

I.   SUMMARY OF THE TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Examiner El Chanti is thanked for conducting a telephone interview with applicants' representatives Christopher J. Palermo and Malgorzata Kulczycka on March 4, 2010.

Goals of the interview were to ensure common understanding of the claimed inventive process and the distinctions over Pfitzner and Amin. Claim 1 was discussed and the Examienr suggested amendments. Although an agreement regarding patentability was not reached, significant progress in understanding the features recited in Claim 1 was made.

II.   ISSUES RELATING TO ALLEGED PRIOR ART

A. CLAIMS 1-4, 6-16 AND 18-30 — 35 U.S.C. § 103(e): PFITZNER, AMIN

Claims 1-4, 6-16 and 18-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pfitzner et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,506,069 ("Pfitzner") in view of Amin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,854,014 ("Amin"). (Final Office Action, page 2) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CLAIM 1

Among other features, present Claim 1 recites:

> forwarding, to an authentication, authorization and access-control server, said authentication, authorization and access request for authentication and authorization of the end user device to the computer network, **and for reconfiguring the authorization and access-control server by storing a dependence between the authentication, authorization and access request and the requesting network access device;**

Support for the amendment is provided at least in paragraphs [25] and [05] of the applicants' specification.

It is well founded that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a), the references cited and relied upon must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. In addition, a sufficient factual basis to support the obviousness rejection must be proffered. *In re Freed*, 165 USPQ 570 (CCPA 1970); *In re Warner*, 154 USPQ 173 (CCPA 1967); *In re Lunsford*, 148 USPQ 721 (CCPA 1966).

Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not described or suggested by Pfitzner and Amin, individually or in combination. For example, Pfitzner and Amin fail to describe or suggest that an AAA request is forwarded to an AAA control server not only for authorization of an end user device, but also **for reconfiguring the AAA control server by storing a dependence between the AAA request and the requesting network access device**, as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action acknowledged that Pfitzner fails to describe any type of authentication and authorization to an AAA server. (Office Action: page 3)

Not only does Pfitzner fail to describe authentication to an AAA server, but also fails to describe reconfiguration of the AAA server. Pfitzner describes user requests that provide information about the type of the online meeting that the user wants to join and the type of computing environment that the user has. (Pfitzner: Col. 7, ll. 16-24) Based on the request and information stored in Pfitzner's databases (Pfitzner: Col. 5, ll. 23-26), Pfitzner's server redirects the user to the URL which is customized to interface with the user's computing environment. (Pfitzner: Col. 10, ll. 56-58) However, Pfitzner's databases are maintained and configured independently from processing user requests. Neither the information about the requested meeting nor the information about the user's computing environment is used by Pfitzner to reconfigure the databases and servers. Pfitzner does not describe that the information from the user request is used to reconfigure Pfitzner's databases or servers. Further, Pfitzner does not describe that dependence between the user request and the requesting device is used to reconfigure the server, as claimed.

Amin describes an authentication and authorization request; however, Amin's requests are not forwarded to an AAA control server to reconfigure the AAA control server, as claimed.

Amin describes authenticating the user based on the information provided by the user and the information already stored in the AAA control server. (Amin: Col. 14, ll. 13-16) Information about the user is retrieved from a database that stores the user's profile. (Amin: Col. 14, ll. 16-23) However, none of the information provided by the user is used to reconfigure a server in Amin. Amin does not describe that the information from the user request is used to reconfigure the AAA server, as claimed. Further, since Amin does not describe dependencies between the user request and the requesting device, Amin cannot use such information to reconfigure the AAA server, as claimed.

The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to implement the use of Amin's AAA requests to Pfitzner's approach, and that the motivation to do so would have been common knowledge. (Office Action: page 3) This is incorrect. Even in combination, Pfitzner and Amin do not provide the claimed approach. Neither Pfitzner nor Amin describes or suggests reconfiguring an AAA control server using information from an AAA request forwarded to the AAA control server for authorization of the end user device, as claimed. Hence, no combination of Pfitzner with Amin would have provided all features that are recited in Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 11, 13, 19 AND 23

Claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 recite features similar to those in Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 are patentable over Pfitzner for the same reasons as for Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. CLAIMS 2-4, 12, 14-16 AND 24-26— 35 U.S.C. § 103(e): PFITZNER, AMIN, ANDERSON

Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly anticipated by Pfitzner et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,506,069 ("Pfitzner") in view of Amin and in further view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,089,316 ("Anderson"). (Office Action: page 10) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26 depend from Claims 1, 11, 13, 19 and 23, respectively.

Claim 1 (11, 13, 19 and 23, respectively) recites at least one feature that is not disclosed in Pfitzner and Amin, individually or in combination. Further, Anderson does not cure the deficiencies of Pfitzner and Amin with respect to Claim 1 (11, 13, 19 and 23). Therefore, and due to claim dependency, Pfitzner, Amin and Anderson, individually or in combination, fail to describe or suggest the whole subject matter recited in Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The claims that are not discussed above depend directly or indirectly on the claims that have been discussed. Therefore, those claims are patentable for the reasons given above. In addition, each of the dependent claims separately introduces features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite positive resolution of the examination, separate arguments are not provided for each of the dependent claims at this time.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A petition for an extension of time is hereby made to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any applicable fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: April 28, 2010

/MalgorzataAKulczycka#50496/
Malgorzata A. Kulczycka
Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110
Telephone: (408) 414-1228
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076